

CORRECTING THE PAGE ORDER OF WORDSWORTH'S NOTEBOOK DC MS. 13

Most of Wordsworth's blank verse was composed for his never completed, lifelong project of writing a great philosophic poem, a project that he called 'The Recluse'. So most of Wordsworth's blank verse was never published in his lifetime; indeed, most of Wordsworth's blank verse was left in multiple versions in never finalized manuscripts whose numerous layers of revision are extremely difficult to date and differentiate from each other. Wordsworth only oversaw the publication of one major part of his 'Recluse' project – *The Excursion*, printed in 1814 – and as it went to press his sister Dorothy wrote to Catherine Clarkson: 'We are all most thankful that William has brought his mind to consent to printing so much of this work; for the MSS. were in such a state that, if it had pleased Heaven to take him from this world, they would have been almost useless'.¹ During Wordsworth's lifetime, most of the rest of 'The Recluse' remained in several such states, including the work that his wife posthumously titled *The Prelude*.

So far, so familiar, but it is not easily apparent even from the recently completed scholarly editions of Wordsworth's poetry published by Cornell University Press that most of the manuscripts in which 'The Recluse' was left were notebooks, which Wordsworth used throughout his writing life: not one for each project, but one at a time, for whatever he was working on at that time, until the volume was forgotten or full. In these notebooks, much overlaps that editions separate: there are few clear boundaries between one poem and another, between neat copies and messy drafts, between one person's writing and another's, or between writing entered when the notebook was in active use and writing added at a later date. The Cornell series separates Wordsworth's manuscript work into its various volumes according to the poem or collection with which that work is most obviously associated: each edition begins with 'reading texts' of the work to which the volume is dedicated, followed by transcriptions and

¹ *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Middle Years, Part II, 1812-1820*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, rev. Mary Moorman and Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p.140.

photographs of manuscript material that is deemed relevant. It is therefore difficult to gain a sense from the series of Wordsworth's notebooks as notebooks: entries written into particular manuscripts over a few pages in a short period of time end up dispersed over several Cornell volumes, while entries such as quotations from other writers, work by other writers, and notes in prose are often missed out altogether.²

I became aware of this when I began working on Wordsworth's unpublished poem 'The Ruined Cottage' in 2007. Wordsworth started composing some blank verse about the ruined hut of a dead woman in the spring of 1797, and by June of that year he had enough to read aloud to Samuel Taylor Coleridge something that Dorothy Wordsworth called 'William's new poem *The Ruined Cottage*'.³ In the spring of 1798, he wrote more for the poem, and then reworked the whole thing, immediately adding more again until it doubled in length. In 1799, he cut half of this and rewrote what remained, later rewriting the cut half in the winter of 1801-2. The halves were recombined and rewritten in the winter of 1803-4 as a new poem under a new title, 'The Pedlar'; between 1809 and 1812 this work went through another rewrite to turn it into Book I of *The Excursion*. But at no point during the years in which the work was still called 'The Ruined Cottage' was any of it left or produced in a completely fair or finished state. It was left, instead, in notebooks, none of which offer a clean or self-contained version of the verse, and all of which include writing excluded from the available 'reading texts' and overlapping work on other projects. Words, phrases, and whole passages are repeated across work on what are now thought of as discrete poems; pages and preoccupations are shared by 'Ruined Cottage' lines with poetry

² In 'The Cornell Wordsworth: A History', Jared Curtis reveals that in the early stages of planning, Stephen Parrish hoped to publish 'some of the early notebooks as notebooks' as part of the series (pp.2-3). Bruce Graver explains why this plan changed: Robert Woof and James MacGillivray were planning an Oxford University Press edition of Wordsworth's early verse notebooks during the same period. In the end, no notebook edition was produced by either group. See 'Editing Wordsworth in the Twentieth Century', in *The Oxford Handbook of William Wordsworth*, ed. Richard Gravil and Daniel Robinson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 816-832. Curtis's 'History' can be found at: http://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/html/WYSIWYGfiles/files/Cornell_Wordsworth_History.pdf.

³ *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Early Years, 1787-1805*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, rev. Chester L. Shaver (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p.189.

published in *Lyrical Ballads*, work on what became *The Prelude*, long fragments later incorporated into *The Excursion*, and a lot of verse that Wordsworth never published at all.

Such connections make sense when you consider the peculiar ways in which Wordsworth's notebooks were used. Although each was filled over a relatively short period of time, the Wordsworth family used the pages of their notebooks irregularly, often entering writing in apparently random sections, and leaving and returning to gaps in non-consecutive fashion, sometimes after many years. Freed from the real randomness that would result from simply using pages one after the other whatever the matter in question, this practice seems to have prompted Wordsworth to make connections between the various materials that his notebooks contain. There are echoes and links between writing entered on consecutive pages by different family members on different occasions, as if returning to use a particular part of a notebook also meant thinking again about whatever was written there already. There are also ongoing preoccupations running cover to cover, as if returning to the notebook itself also meant returning to the train of thought that it had set in motion. The more I have looked, the more I have become convinced that Wordsworth's notebooks are not arbitrary collections of disconnected material at all. These are not just notebooks that contain composition. They are also notebooks that reflect upon composition. They testify to a self-consciousness that was facilitated by the practices through which they were filled.

As I have worked with Wordsworth's notebooks over the last decade, I have therefore found myself having to think more and more about page order. In many cases, this has thrown up bibliographical as well as interpretative problems. What follows is an account of how one of those problems was solved.

The manuscript now catalogued as Dove Cottage Manuscript 13 is a slim, unstitched, handmade notebook, with surprisingly large leaves: 25cm wide and 39cm high, giving it the expansive page size of something like a large art book. It was made by simply folding a small

stack of large sheets of paper in half, of which six sheets survive, two only partially, leaving a total of ten leaves.⁴ The first leaf has been torn off, leaving only a few letters legible, but leaves 2-5 contain blank verse work dating from 1796-97, some neat and some heavily revised, culminating in a page of fragments in which a narrator informs an auditor of the death of a woman named Margaret, pointing out the deterioration of the hut that she used to live in, and describing what her life with her husband used to be like, a difficult time that they went through, and a consequent change in her husband's behaviour. Besides this early work on what became 'The Ruined Cottage', the blank verse in DC MS. 13 includes work on two poems that were extended and published in *Lyrical Ballads* ('Old Man Travelling; Animal Tranquillity and Decay, A Sketch' in 1798 and 'The Old Cumberland Beggar, A Description' in 1800), alongside four unpublished poems, of which two are given titles ('Argument for Suicide' and 'Incipient Madness'), and two are not: they begin 'Yet once again do I behold the forms' and 'I have seen the Baker's horse'. The Wordsworth family then used leaves 7-12 of the manuscript in the winter of 1801, for work on modernisations of Chaucer's Prioress's tale and Manciple's tale, and a poem then believed to be by Chaucer, later published by Wordsworth under the title 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale'; in late 1802, on the back of leaf 5, William and Dorothy Wordsworth copied a translation from Canto I of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, possibly continuing onto leaf 6, which is now missing. There are many differences between the blank verse and the Chaucer and Ariosto work; for one thing, all of the latter is in rhyming iambic pentameter in varying stanza forms; for another, all of the Chaucer work is written with the notebook turned through 90 degrees, in three ruled columns on each page. But significant interests recur throughout.

This is not surprising in the blank verse passages, which are much less discrete than the available 'reading texts' make them seem. In fact, the blank verse in DC MS. 13 overlaps so significantly that it is difficult to be certain about the order in which certain parts were written:

⁴ For a full account of the manuscript, see James Butler's descriptions in *The Ruined Cottage and The Pedlar*, ed. James Butler (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), pp.7-9, p.79.

phrases return throughout work on what are now thought of as distinct poems, either because they were published as such by Wordsworth himself, or because of the ways in which they have been subsequently edited. Wordsworth's preoccupation with the difference between 'the thing called life' and 'the things worth living for', for example, which troubles the first blank verse that survives in the manuscript, 'Argument for Suicide', persists in his descriptions of speaking limbs, unsympathetic stones, and lifelike panes of glass on later pages. But there are interests that run into the Chaucer and Ariosto work too. The blank verse that begins 'Yet once again' describes the 'voice' of the river Derwent as 'Half-heard and half created', and the blank verse that begins 'I have seen the Baker's horse' describes a woman's 'look and voice' as having 'Made up' the 'meaning' of her words, but the interpretation of tone is equally pivotal in the passages of Chaucer that Wordsworth chose to modernise here: in the Prioress's tale, it is because the boy sings 'Alma Redemptoris' in Jewish streets that he is killed, while Phoebus kills his wife in the Manciple's tale because of how he interprets the song of his crow, and the narrator in 'Of the Cuckowe and the Nightingale' is cursed because he understands a cuckoo's call as an accusation of cuckoldry. Since the notebook's contents have been split between five different volumes of the Cornell Wordsworth series, however, connections of this kind have not been easy to see.

With associations echoing forwards and backwards across its pages, when DC MS. 13 is read as a whole notebook it seems more like the site of a developing project than a random collection of individual poems. Unusually, Wordsworth himself inscribed all the blank verse on these pages; it seems significant, therefore, that so many of the notebook's contents raise questions about how difficult it is to convey the tone of a voice in writing, and how critical tone can be to how words are understood. This is not only a notebook in which Wordsworth relinquished speaking for writing as a compositional practice, I think: it is also a notebook in which he reflected upon what that relinquishment entailed. But the four and a half year gap – between spring 1797 when Wordsworth wrote his 'Ruined Cottage' lines on the front of leaf 5

and December 1801 when he began work on the Chaucer modernisations on leaf 7 – has made it easy for scholars to treat DC MS. 13 as a notebook of two halves, with one half or the other falling out of focus. This has had bibliographical as well as interpretative consequences.

James Butler, in his Cornell edition of 'The Ruined Cottage', naturally focuses on the first half of the notebook; Bruce Graver and Jared Curtis, in their Cornell editions of Wordsworth's *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil* and *Poems, in Two Volumes* respectively, naturally focus on the second half. All three editors build on the separate suggestions about each half made by Mark Reed, one in each of his two volumes devoted to Wordsworth's *Chronology*. And although all four agree in describing the manuscript as having been dismantled at some point in the past and recently reconstructed, there are many unnoted disagreements between their accounts of its order and contents.⁵ I believe that this situation has resulted from DC MS. 13 being treated as a notebook of two halves. For keeping its loose leaves in their original order depends upon keeping track of conjugate leaves: that is, upon keeping both ends in sight at once.

Because this was a notebook made by folding a small stack of large sheets of paper in half, most surviving sheets have blank verse work on the front and back of their left hand side, and Chaucer work on the front and back of their right hand side: sheet 2 comprises leaf 2 on the left half and leaf 11 on the right, for example. The sheets were torn down the middle when the notebook was dismantled, but most of the tears could be neatly matched in restoration, allowing conjugate leaves to be paired again, and the order of the sheets themselves is made clear by the ways in which Wordsworth's blank verse work developed over the opening pages: if all the sheets are opened out and laid flat, for example, sheet 3 has to go on top of sheet 2, because of the close relationship between the work titled 'Description of a Beggar' on the front of leaf 3 and the work titled 'Old Man Travelling animal tranquillity and Decay' on the back of leaf 2. This

⁵ Compare Mark L. Reed, *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Early Years 1770-1799* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), p.346; Mark L. Reed, *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Middle Years 1800-1815* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp.132-34n., p.201n.; *Ruined Cottage*, p.7, p.79; *Poems, in Two Volumes, and Other Poems, 1800-1807*, ed. Jared Curtis (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), p.594n.; *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*, ed. Bruce E. Graver (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp.81-143.

does not solve everything, because it is not clear *when* the notebook was dismantled: if the sheets were torn and the leaves dispersed before any of the Ariosto and Chaucer work was written onto them, the original order of the sheets would not necessarily determine the order of the leaves in the second half of the manuscript.⁶ But there are clues enough in the orientation of the Chaucer work to indicate that DC MS. 13 was still a notebook when it was entered in 1801, and that the leaves were still in the same order then that they had been in 1797. That order – the order of 1797 and 1801 – is not the same as the order in which they have been left in the Wordsworth Trust archive for at least the last 17 years, nor is it the same as the order in which they are transcribed and catalogued in Graver's Cornell edition.

In 1979, Butler described DC MS. 13 as 'a gathering of twelve leaves, of which 2-5 and 7-12 are intact'. But the order in which the notebook has been left since at least 1998, when Graver transcribed its second half, is as follows, using Graver's leaf numbers and bold type to single out discrepancies:

Leaf 1r stub

Leaf 1v stub

Leaf 2r blank verse work titled 'Argument for Suicide'

Leaf 2v blank verse work titled 'Old Man Travelling animal tranquillity and Decay' and 'Description of a Beggar'

Leaf 3r blank verse work titled 'Description of a Beggar'

Leaf 3v blank verse work beginning 'Yet once again'

Stub ***Not accounted for***

Leaf 4r blank verse work beginning 'I have seen the Baker's horse'

Leaf 4v blank verse work titled 'Incipient Madness'

Leaf 5r blank verse work on what became 'The Ruined Cottage'

Leaf 5v translation from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*

?

Leaf 7r work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Manciple's tale, c. lines 87-176

Leaf 7v work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Manciple's tale, c. lines 1-86

⁶ Reed speculates on the basis of staining that DC MS. 13 was taken apart 'before completion of the copying of the translation from Ariosto', but discolouration is not much to go by, since it could have happened at any point and for any of several reasons (*Chronology of the Middle Years*, p.201n.).

Leaf 8r blank except title 'Manciple's Tale'

Leaf 8v work on a modernisation later published as 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale', c. lines 196-end

Leaf 9r blank

Leaf 9v work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Manciple's tale, c. lines 177-end

Leaf 10r work on a modernisation later published as 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale', c. lines 41-120

Leaf 10v work on a modernisation later published as 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale', c. lines 121-195

Leaf 11r work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Prioress's tale, c. lines 226-end, and 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale', c. lines 1-40

Leaf 11v work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Prioress's tale, c. lines 149-225

Leaf 12r rough work on a modernisation of Chaucer's Manciple's tale and 'The Cuckoo and the Nightingale'

Leaf 12v blank

In this order, there is no sign of the missing leaf 6 mentioned by Butler: Graver starts numbering the leaves of Wordsworth's Chaucer work at leaf 7, as if they came after a leaf 6, but with the notebook in the order in which he found it, work on the Ariosto translation on leaf 5 and lines 87-176 of the Manciple's tale face each other without interruption. In fact, no stub can ever have stood between these two pages of work, because they are on conjugate leaves: this 'leaf 5' and 'leaf 7' are two ends of the same sheet of paper. What Graver calls leaf 9, on the other hand, does have a stub – it is one of the notebook's two half-sheets of paper, of which the other half has gone missing – but its stub is not accounted for in his transcription. Given the way in which DC MS. 13 was constructed, the torn out leaf that forms the conjugate to his 'leaf 9' would have stood between leaves 3 and 4, yet Butler makes no mention of having seen a stub at that point.

What I think must have happened is this: at some point between 1979 and 1998, the half-sheet that Graver describes as 'leaf 9' was moved. What Graver calls 'leaf 9' was once leaf 7, and the stub that is all that remains of its conjugate leaf was what Butler saw as a missing leaf 6. What clinches this is seeing the notebook as a series of folded sheets of paper, and keeping track of conjugate leaves:⁷

⁷ The archival file for DC MS. 13 contains a page of notes by Dr Peter Laver, Librarian at Dove Cottage from the late 1970s until his early death in 1983, which does not mention any stubs or pair conjugate leaves, but otherwise confirms that this first table represents the order of the notebook when Butler worked with it, by indicating that during Laver's librarianship, the Wordsworths' work on the end of the Manciple's tale followed straight after their work on the Ariosto translation. Why the leaf had been moved from its original place by the 1990s is a mystery.

Sheet 1	<i>Leaf 1r</i> stub <i>Leaf 1v</i> stub	<i>Leaf 12v</i> blank <i>Leaf 12r</i> rough work on Manciple's tale and Cuckoo
Sheet 2	<i>Leaf 2r</i> 'Argument for Suicide' <i>Leaf 2v</i> 'Old Man Travelling'	<i>Leaf 11v</i> Prioress's tale c. lines 149-225 <i>Leaf 11r</i> Prioress's tale c. lines 226-end, Cuckoo c. lines 1-40
Sheet 3	<i>Leaf 3r</i> 'Description of a Beggar' <i>Leaf 3v</i> 'Yet once again'	<i>Leaf 10v</i> Cuckoo c. lines 121-195 <i>Leaf 10r</i> Cuckoo c. lines 41-120
Sheet 4	<i>Leaf 4r</i> 'I have seen the Baker's horse' <i>Leaf 4v</i> 'Incipient Madness'	<i>Leaf 9v</i> Cuckoo c. lines 196-end <i>Leaf 9r</i> blank except title 'Manciple's Tale'
Sheet 5	<i>Leaf 5r</i> 'Ruined Cottage' work <i>Leaf 5v</i> Ariosto translation	<i>Leaf 8v</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 1-86 <i>Leaf 8r</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 87-176
Sheet 6	<i>Leaf 6r</i> stub <i>Leaf 6v</i> stub	<i>Leaf 7v</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 177-end <i>Leaf 7r</i> blank

This makes a real difference to understanding the Chaucer work in this notebook. While the order in which it had been left when Graver transcribed DC MS. 13 made the Chaucer material look as if much of it had been entered at random, raising the possibility that the notebook had already been dismantled when it was written on these leaves, in this corrected order it becomes clear that the Wordsworth family entered it working consecutively from the back to the front of the notebook, which is therefore very likely still to have been a notebook at this point. The only deviation from consecutive work is on the new leaf 10, which, in the orientation in which it was left when DC MS. 13 was reconstructed, reverses the back-to-front order of the rest of the Wordsworths' Chaucer work. But further analysis of the manuscript reveals that this leaf was actually inserted into the notebook the wrong way around during its first reconstruction and has remained the wrong way up ever since: the orientation of the writing runs in the opposite direction to the other work that surrounds it, and, crucially, its watermark is the opposite way up to all the others.⁸

The conjugate leaf for leaf 10 is leaf 3, which is the only leaf of this notebook that has not remained in the Wordsworth Trust's collections: it is held by the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York. So the reconstruction error is understandable: this is the only surviving complete sheet that could not be accurately reassembled by matching tear lines. The torn edge of leaf 3 has

⁸ That leaf 10 was inserted in the manuscript the wrong way around at its first reconstruction is confirmed by Laver's notes, which indicate that it already had that back to front orientation when he worked with it.

unfortunately been cut away, but its watermark is the same way up as all the other watermarks in the notebook: this means that the watermark on leaf 10 has to have the same orientation too, which means in turn that leaf 10 was originally the other way up. The notebook must therefore originally have been ordered as follows:

Sheet 1	<i>Leaf 1r</i> stub <i>Leaf 1v</i> stub	<i>Leaf 12v</i> blank <i>Leaf 12r</i> rough work on Manciple's tale and Cuckoo
Sheet 2	<i>Leaf 2r</i> 'Argument for Suicide' <i>Leaf 2v</i> 'Old Man Travelling'	<i>Leaf 11v</i> Prioress's tale c. lines 149-225 <i>Leaf 11r</i> Prioress's tale c. lines 226-end, Cuckoo c. lines 1-40
Sheet 3	<i>Leaf 3r</i> 'Description of a Beggar' <i>Leaf 3v</i> 'Yet once again'	<i>Leaf 10v</i> Cuckoo c. lines 41-120 <i>Leaf 10r</i> Cuckoo c. lines 121-195
Sheet 4	<i>Leaf 4r</i> 'I have seen the Baker's horse' <i>Leaf 4v</i> 'Incipient Madness'	<i>Leaf 9v</i> Cuckoo c. lines 196-end <i>Leaf 9r</i> blank except title 'Manciple's Tale'
Sheet 5	<i>Leaf 5r</i> 'Ruined Cottage' work <i>Leaf 5v</i> Ariosto translation	<i>Leaf 8v</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 1-86 <i>Leaf 8r</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 87-176
Sheet 6	<i>Leaf 6r</i> stub <i>Leaf 6v</i> stub	<i>Leaf 7v</i> Manciple's tale c. lines 177-end <i>Leaf 7r</i> blank

Looking at the notebook like this, it seems extremely likely that it used to have at least one more sheet, in between sheet 1 and sheet 2, and that the right hand side of that sheet contained work on the first 148 lines of the Prioress's tale. Graver makes exactly this suggestion, drawing attention to a reference in Dorothy Wordsworth's journal for February 1802, in which she describes 'The Chaucer' arriving 'not only misbound but a leaf or two wanting': Graver suggests that if 'The Chaucer' refers to DC MS. 13, this may have been when the extra sheet or sheets went missing, or that it may have happened on one of the occasions when the Wordsworths returned to the manuscript to revise the Chaucer modernisations (he points out that there are revisions on these pages added by Dora Wordsworth, and also by John Carter, who only started working for the family in 1813).⁹

What work might have stood on the left hand side of the potentially missing sheet or sheets is a mystery, as are the contents of the leaves that have been removed, leaving only stubs. A few letters are visible on the stub that is all that remains of leaf 1 of the notebook, and Reed

⁹ *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*, pp.11-15.

and Graver have associated them with Wordsworth's work on the Manciple's tale.¹⁰ As with any argument that works with the evidence of traces of ink on stubs of paper, there are reasons to pause over this: the letters are written with the page orientated vertically, unlike all of the Chaucer work entered in the second half of the notebook, which was written with the pages turned through 90 degrees; it is also difficult to see why Wordsworth would have left the first one (or two) leaves of DC MS. 13 blank in 1796-97, and only used them years later. Moreover, although I agree with Graver that the letters on the front of the stub are in Mary Hutchinson's handwriting, so are many of the poems in earlier manuscripts such as DC MS. 11, so the letters do not necessarily date from the same period as the Chaucer work. There are also some tiny marks on the stub that follows the Ariosto translation – leaf 6 in the corrected order – which Curtis associates with the Ariosto work, but which could just as well be part of something else.¹¹

Whatever was once written on the missing leaves of DC MS. 13, the leaves have at least now been restored to their original order and orientation.¹² And although working with DC MS. 13 as a whole notebook does not provide all the answers, it does allow greater clarity on

¹⁰ *Chronology of the Middle Years*, p.132n.; *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*, p.97n. A quarter of the way down stub 1r, there are two largish traces of a darker ink from a thicker nib than that which Wordsworth used for the rest of his blank verse in DC MS. 13, with two smaller traces in between them; three letters, also in darker ink from a thicker nib, are visible at the very bottom. Reed and Graver both state that the letters are T | A | Th (although in *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil* these letters are mistakenly located on stub 1v), but Graver has recently re-read them as W | W | The, and I am grateful to him for generously communicating this to me. A third of the way down stub 1v, there are traces of the ends of two words that seem to be written in the same ink and with the same thin nib as 'Argument for Suicide': Reed reads them as e | ay, but I am less confident; Graver concurs with Reed about the 'ay'. The largish ink traces at the top of stub 1r look like the edge of a title, and Graver has suggested to me that the spacing of all these traces on the recto and verso give a strong indication that a fair copy of Wordsworth's Manciple work could once have stood here, possibly copied at a much later date, and including the description of the Manciple from Chaucer's Prologue as introduction to a fair copy. The change in ink and pen between stubs 1r and 1v suggests that if a version of Wordsworth's Manciple work did once stand here, it was copied by multiple hands.

¹¹ Curtis mistakenly locates the Ariosto translation work on '7v', and reads the marks on the stub that follows as an ascender and a capital 'M', but the ink does not match closely enough to Wordsworth's Ariosto work for me to feel entirely confident that this is evidence of that work having been continued here (*Poems, in Two Volumes*, p.594n.).

¹² Working with the Curator of the Wordsworth Trust, Jeff Cowton, I reordered the notebook on the 10th September 2014, and we determined on the reorientation of leaf 10 on the 5th January 2015, using the Jerwood Centre light box to check the manuscript's watermarks and drawing on Cowton's notes on and photographs of leaf 3, taken in the Pierpont Morgan Library. On the 20th April 2015, the notebook was professionally restored by Christopher Clarkson, who returned its pages to their original order and orientation and included new high quality reproductions of the Pierpont Morgan Library leaf. The changes to bear in mind when using Graver's edition are that what he calls leaf 7 is now leaf 8; what he calls leaf 8 is now leaf 9; what he calls leaf 9 is now leaf 7; and what he calls leaf 10 is now flipped over, so that his 10r is now 10v, and his 10v is now 10r. I have noted these changes in the Jerwood Centre Reading Room copy. I would like to take this opportunity to record my gratitude and admiration for Jeff Cowton, Beccy Turner, and all the Wordsworth Trust staff, and to express my thanks to Jeff Cowton in particular for his generous and insightful help with this work on DC MS. 13.

bibliographical matters, and these can in turn clarify matters of interpretation. For it is working with and seeing the notebook as a whole document that reveals the extent to which preoccupations evident in its blank verse recur on later pages. This not only suggests how important those preoccupations were to Wordsworth, it also suggests that he associated them with DC MS. 13 in particular: that returning to use this notebook also meant returning to the concerns that he had been exploring on earlier leaves. This is a practice evident in all his notebooks of this period, and beginning to understand it opens up new ways of thinking about the development of Wordsworth's blank verse during these critical years, and new insights into the self-conscious experimentation and reflection that that development involved.

RUTH ABBOTT

University of Cambridge